Nonpoint Source Tracking and Monitoring Council (TMC)
– March 02, 2005 Meeting Notes

These notes reference presentations from the subject meeting. If you did not attend the meeting and would like the electronic version (Power Point) of the presentations, please contact Steve Fagundes at (916) 341-5487 or sfagundes@waterboards.ca.gov. During the presentations, questions were posed and responded to by the various presenters. A summary of these questions and their responses are provided below.

Questions and Responses

Question #1: Why are point sources left out of the mission statement?

Response: The mission statement and objectives of the NPS TMC (see Attachment 3 – NPS TMC Mission Statement and Attachment 4 – NPS TMC Objectives) are focused on the impact of nonpoint sources of pollution on water quality and beneficial uses. Although, point sources are an important source of pollution, our initial focus will be on the impact of nonpoint sources. Eventually, the SWRCB's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) will form its own monitoring council that will address water quality impacts from both point and nonpoint sources of pollution. We envision at that time, the NPS TMC could become a subgroup of the SWAMP monitoring council.

Question #2: Are the six key questions the "drivers" of the NPS Program?

Response: Yes, the "six key questions" or NPS TMC objectives (see Attachment 4) frame the scope of work for the NPS TMC. All efforts of the NPS TMC will focus on addressing these objectives.

Question #3: Does this program augment the Clean Water Act (CWA) section 303(d) listing process, etc.?

Response: Yes, the NPS TMC will enhance the CWA section 303(d) listing process by providing additional water quality information and resources to the "listing process".

Question #4: With respect management measure (MM) implementation - what has to happen by 2013?

Response: Federal law requires that by 2013, all 61 MMs identified in *Plan for California's NPS Pollution Control Program* (NPS Program Plan) must be implemented throughout California. In order to determine the extent of MM implementation consistent with federal requirements and the effectiveness of the MMs and related management practices (see NPS TMC Objective #6), the CA NPS Program needs to track the extent of MM/MP implementation.

Question #5: Do the 61 MM's actually work in the field?

Response: The 61 MMs have been tested in the field, but most of the field-verified information is for work performed in states other than California. As such, the MMs/MPs are applicable in California, but the removal efficiency associated with their application in California soil and climate conditions has not been verified. The California NPS Program has developed the NPS MP Miner, which will be populated with information on MPs specific to California conditions.

Question #6: To what degree does SWRCB use the Natural Resources Project Inventory (NRPI) database?

Response: The SWRCB has continued support use of the NRPI database developed by the University of California – Davis Information Center for the Environment (UCD – ICE). Projects supported through the various California propositions and grants (including CWA section 319) are required to submit pertinent information into NRPI database.

Question #7: Does the California Monitoring and Assessment Program (CMAP) have a definition of forested areas?

Response: Staff from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), SWRCB, California Coastal Commission (CCC), and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) are currently working on the decision rules for forested areas.

Question #8: What is the timeline for CMAP?

Response: Using funding from the California NPS Program, provided by USEPA through the CWA section 319 grant, CMAP was setup as a five-year study.

Question #9: Is the North Coast CMAP Report in the works?

Response: The North Coast CMAP Report is scheduled for release in June/July 2005.

Question #10: How many sample sites total are there in CMAP?

Response: CMAP involves bioassessment monitoring at 50 sites/year for five years. CMAP data will be entered into the SWAMP database.

Question #11: Where does CMAP Geographic Information System (GIS) data reside?

Response: The CMAP GIS data can be found at the CDFG website.

Question #12: Can we still provide land use input into CMAP?

Response: Yes, there are still opportunities to provide land use information for CMAP.

Question #13: How will the work tasks associated with the NPS TMC be completed and by whom (i.e., inventory)?

Response: The work tasks associated with the NPS TMC will be completed primarily through the Inter Agency Coordinating Committee (IACC). The IACC is composed of over twenty (20) state agencies with authorities and responsibilities associated with NPS pollution. Subcommittees have

been formed for the six (6) land use categories of the NPS Program – agriculture, urban, forestry (silviculture), marinas and recreational boating, wetlands, and hydromodification. Each of the subcommittees is led by staff of the SWRCB and/or CCC and it is anticipated that these subcommittees will take on most of the work associated with the NPS TMC. Additional work will be accomplished through contracts funds provided by USEPA through the CWA section 319 Program.

Question #14: Is there a deadline for submitting a proposal for CWA section 319 funding as part of the NPS TMC?

Response: In order to be considered for the $200,000 available this year (as part of the USEPA's five [5] year annual commitment of $500,000 for NPS monitoring), a short "first cut proposal" should be provided to Sam Ziegler (USEPA) by March 12th.

Question #15: Does USEPA or SWRCB have central clearinghouse for monitoring efforts?

Response: Neither the SWRCB nor USEPA have central clearinghouse for NPS monitoring efforts.

Following the presentations, each of the meeting participants (see Attachment 3) was given the opportunity to provide a brief description of their current tracking and monitoring activities. The descriptions are provided below:

California Bay-Delta Authority (CBDA) - Dennis Bowker and Donna Podger

- CBDA has lots of data gathering programs and is willing to contribute, but wants to see efforts to generate partnerships between the involved parties. They want to see exchange value to increase value with respect to sharing of information.

- CBDA has 227 projects totaling $195,000,000 and needs to determine how to develop performance measures for the projects. Has struggled to collect fish tissue data and water quality project data reporting.

California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) – Michael August and Stephen Bakkeu

- CDPR installs management practices (MP) for base sites, but has no comprehensive water quality monitoring to determine their effectiveness.

California Coastal Commission (CCC) – Jack Gregg and Ross Clark

- CCC does minimal monitoring and the limited monitoring done is program specific, not management measure (MM) or MP specific.

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB-1) – Janet Blake

- RWQCB-1 is involved in the following programs that address water quality information: (1) Watershed Assessment Program; (2) Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL); (3) Grant projects funneled into Natural

Resources Project Inventory (NRPI) and California Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP); and (4) Ongoing SWAMP efforts.

Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP) – Eric Stein

- In addition to coordinating approximately 30 years of data, SCCWRP is involved in the following programs that address water quality information: (1) Southern California BIGHT; (2) municipal separate storm water system (MS4) monitoring; (3) wetlands regional monitoring; and (4) watershed monitoring.

San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI) – Ranier Hoenicke

- SFEI is involved coastal wetland and regional monitoring programs. They want to add value to existing monitoring programs and connect State agencies to add benefit.

Central Coast Long-term Environmental Assessment Network (CCLEAN) – Dane Hardin

- CCLEAN is a multidisciplinary monitoring program in the Monterey Bay Area. They are working on measuring source loadings and the effects of nutrients, organics, and bacteria. The resulting data goes into the Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) database housed at the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB-3).

Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) – Bridget Hoover

- MBNMS is attempting to answer the question of MM/MP effectiveness. Focusing on the impacts of nitrates, last year they held a stakeholder workshop, determined monitoring sites, monitoring parameters, frequency of monitoring, and MMs that are being implemented.

Department of Conservation (DOC) – Andrew Rush

- DOC is involved recycling activities, oil and gas drilling, landslide sedimentation, and seismic issues (through the California Geologic Survey). Their Office of Mining Reclamation addresses mining reclamation, abandoned mines, and acid mine drainage issues. Other NPS related areas include farmland conversion to urban land use (especially in the Central Valley). DOC has a watershed grant program with 48 grantees regularly reporting on their workplan progress with some water quality information.

Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB-6) – Tom Suk

- RWQCB-6 is working on determining the effectiveness of NPS MMs/MPs through their efforts with actual on-the-ground activities. They have results from environmental projects (10 years of data) and are willing to share the information.

University of CA, Davis Information Center for the Environment (UCD-ICE) – Kevin Ward

- UCD-ICE manages the Natural Resources Project Inventory (NRPI) database. The NRPI database contains MM information and water quality monitoring information (e.g., types of monitoring) for numerous projects through out the state.

CA Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) – Dana Stokes

- CIWMB has provided $16,000,000 in grants to local agencies with a portion of the funds going to storm water programs and oil recycling.

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB-2) – Karen Taberski

- RWQCB-2 related programs and activities include: ambient water monitoring, Clean Estuary Project, TMDL, storm water, bay protection and toxics cleanup, and Department of Defense (DOD) site remediation and cleanup.

- Indicated that the challenge of the NPS Program is to develop strategies to answer each of the monitoring objectives or questions.

Colorado River Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB-7) – Doug Wylie

- RWQCB-7 is concentrating on irrigated agriculture and implementation of related TMDLs. They are working with the CA Farm Bureau in tracking MMs/MPs implementation and determine water quality improvement through monitoring by the irrigation districts.

Coalition for Urban/Rural Environmental Stewardship (CURES) – Parry Klasssen

- CURES represents a coalition group as part of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB-5) irrigated agriculture waiver. As part of the waiver, 75 sites are being monitored using SWAMP procedures. MMs/MPs will be implemented and tracked through a PRISM grant and will also coordinate surveys to generate implementation information.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) – Clay Brandow

- CDF evaluates forest practices using pre and post harvest inspections. CDF has a monitoring study group that is evaluating the effectiveness of MPs (see CDF website). In-stream studies have also been performed as part of an interagency mitigation-monitoring program on timber harvest operations. CDF also sponsors research and sediment studies.

Following these brief descriptions of their current tracking and monitoring activities, a general discussion was held and the participants provided comments and suggestions for the NPS TMC to consider. The comments and suggestions are provided below:

- Develop glossary/definitions of key terms.

- Prepare a diagram of how various State and federal programs relate.
- Need to have outcome evaluation in place as well as MM tracking.
- Need to focus on high-risk dischargers (especially in agriculture).
- Make sure the MM's actually work before putting them in place.
- What can SWRCB do for partners – how can we achieve effective partnerships?
- Need to add value by combining funding sources.
- How can we integrate project data into these data efforts?
- SWRCB and Cal/EPA are looking at performance measures and will soon require.
- US EPA headquarters has unrealistic expectations for documenting water quality improvements nation-wide.
- Be strategic in answering the monitoring questions - focus on scale.
- Should have SWAMP training (for everyone) and make more readily available SWAMP tools and templates.
- Need to provide additional funding to populate SWAMP database.
- PRISM funded software to track BMPs—rural coalition.
- Direction 'from the top' for grant recipients to learn about effective monitoring.
- Turn monitoring questions into positive statements.
- Keep monitoring questions 1 and 4; turn the others into statements.
- Look for indicators of health, do not just focus on impairments.
- Come up with core indicators of water quality health.
- Can we have one website for all agencies who monitor water quality?
- Single "piece of paper"/diagram showing how the programs link.
- Encourage peer-reviewed results for effect of BMPs in California.
- Focus on what scale to ask questions.
- Get data, models, learning out to grantee committee (not always sharing their databases).
- Put on forum—to assess BMP effectiveness.
- Consistent scientific capability and methodology.

- Measure beneficial uses and are they being met and not just water quality standards?
- Does US EPA have a model monitoring program for a complex watershed?

Proposed Topics for the Upcoming NPS Tracking and Monitoring Council (TMC) Meeting

1. Monitoring Performance and Assessment Training Workshop. Water quality monitoring is conducted by numerous local agencies, stakeholder groups, and other State and/or federal grant recipients. The technical leaders of these environmental projects need to be able to assure the collection of scientifically defensible data and efficient use of monitoring dollars, which requires a focused monitoring design. This topic will focus on the efforts of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to develop a training workshop tailored for technical leaders and data users interested in environmental monitoring. The training session(s) will provide an understanding of monitoring design and data quality concepts, as well as knowledge of available resources and tools. The workshops will enhance clear scientific communication among those conducting monitoring under the SWRCB Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) "umbrella" using various State and federal grants. The initial training workshop will be held at the Third California NPS Source Biennial Conference, scheduled for November 7-9 in Sacramento. Additional workshops will be held throughout California to educate environmental project receiptients on successful development of monitoring programs.

2. San Joaquin Valley "Virtual" Monitoring Coordination. This topic will focus on SWRCB efforts, in cooperation with Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB-5), to develop an on-line, water quality monitoring directory for the San Joaquin Valley. The inventory would be a web site that has a map of the watershed with sampling points that could be pulled up by site, subwatershed, and/or agency or program. Generalized information on constituents sampled, frequency, name of study/program, and anticipated study period would also be available--but most important, would be contact information and/or a link where the user could go for additional information and/or data.

3. California Monitoring and Assessment Project (CMAP). This project is a joint effort of the SWRCB SWAMP and NPS Programs to assess the status, extent, and trends in indicators of conditions of specific surface water types and to evaluate associations between observed biological effects, physical/chemical stressors, and NPS land use categories. This topic will provide information on the current results of CMAP (e.g., North Coast CMAP Report); what these results mean in terms of water quality assessments; and their applicability to other monitoring programs.

4. Data Management for California Water Quality Monitoring. This topic will be an information exchange on the water quality monitoring programs; associated databases managed by other State and federal agencies (e.g., Department of Water Resources, U.S. Geological Survey, etc.); and how they can be coordinated with the NPS Program. The discussion will also address the necessity for and possible solutions to the needs of TMC members with respect to a statewide monitoring inventory.

5. Data Management for California Management Measure (MM) Tracking. This topic will be an information exchange on the techniques currently used for MM tracking; databases

managed by State and/or federal agencies (e.g., Central Coast RWQCB, etc.) for MM tracking; and how they can be coordinated with the NPS Program. The discussion will also address the necessity for and possible solutions to the needs of TMC members with respect to MM and/or management practice tracking and the development of partnerships.

6. Discussion of Content and Status of Senate Bill 1070 (Kehoe). This topic would focus on the requirements and status of the proposed legislation by Senator Kehoe. The proposed legislation would require the California Environmental Protection Agency and the Resources Agency, on or before December 1, 2006, to enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for the purposes of establishing the California Water Quality Monitoring Council. The bill would require the MOU to describe the means by which the monitoring council will work to: (a) reduce redundancies, inefficiencies, and inadequacies in existing data collection programs and (b) ensure that sufficient information is collected to track improvements in water quality and evaluate the effectiveness of programs administered by the SWRCB, RWQCBs, and other water quality improvement projects in achieving clean water and healthy ecosystems.